UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/853,976	05/10/2001	Anna M. Zara	10007988	8110

7590 05/10/2005

HEWLETT-PACKARD COMANY
Intellectual Property Administration
P.O. Box 272400
Fort Collins, CO 80527-2400

EXAMINER	
ZEENDER, FLORIAN M	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
3627	

DATE MAILED: 05/10/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/853,976	ZARA ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	F. Ryan Zeender	3627	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *07 April 2005*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *59,60,63-66,68-70,72-76 and 78-83* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *59,60,63-66,68-70,72-76 and 78-83* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 59-60, 63-66, 68-70, 72-76, 78-83 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jones et al. (US 2004/0254863).

Jones et al. disclose, inherently teach, or make obvious an automated (0010) computer implemented method for ordering and tracking components (see for example paragraphs 0003, 0005, 0010, 0011, 0029) required to assemble an asset, the method comprising: creating an asset record (for example 0034) where the asset is comprised of a plurality of components (0003), creating a purchase order for the components of the asset (0010, 0045, 0052, 0054, 0055), storing purchase order information and associated asset record in a management database (0029, 0034, 0045, 0054), updating the asset record when changes occur (0057), determining whether all components required for assembling the asset have been received (for example 0010), transmitting purchase orders to a vendor (0067), use of templates (0044), the asset record having physical descriptions (0054), the asset having an unique ID (0047, 0056).

Jones et al. lack the teaching of the step of updating the asset record being automatic without human intervention.

It would have been an obvious design choice to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Jones et al. to automate (without human intervention) the updating step, as it is well known in business that automating a process and eliminating human intervention is often cost effective and may increase reliability.

Re claim 65, Jones et al. lack the teaching of container including the component having a code with information on the purchase order of the component. It is well known in the shipping industry to place a label with a code on the container of a purchased product whereby the code contains information (for example ID number) on the purchase order of the product. Therefore, it would have been an obvious design choice at the time of the invention to have a code containing purchase order information on the container in order to acquire information without opening the container.

Re claims 66 and 76, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to receive specific details regarding the purchase order information in order to keep accurate records and to ensure that the components are correct for the asset.

Re claims 69 and 78-79: it is an obvious design choice as to where the asset is deployed.

Re claim 70: It is well known in the art to place the asset ID on the deployed asset in order to be able to locate/identify the asset at a future date.

Re claim 72 and 78: This limitation is well known in the art, specifically when the asset is a computer.

Re claim 83: Updating assets (for example automatically updating software) through a network is well known in the art of computers and software.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to all pending claims have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to F. Ryan Zeender whose telephone number is 571) 272-6790. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday, 8am-5pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Bob Olszewski can be reached on (571) 272-6788.

The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

F. Zeender
Primary Examiner, A.U. 3627
May 5, 2005

5/5/05

F. RYAN ZEENDER
PRIMARY EXAMINER